

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 985

CE 011 045

AUTHOR Cohen, Wilbur J.
TITLE Needed Federal Policy in Education for Century III. Occasional Paper No. 24.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center for Vocational Education.
PUB DATE Jan 77
NOTE 16 p. Paper presented at a staff development seminar at the Center for Vocational Education, Ohio State University (Columbus, Ohio)
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Educational Legislation; *Educational Planning; *Educational Policy; Educational Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Government; *Government Role; Post Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS United States

ABSTRACT

Several issues in education resulting from the change to the Carter administration, and how these changes will affect the remainder of the twentieth century, are discussed in this speech. The author first makes the assumption that there is the possibility of a sharp break in the educational policy of the last 10 years, noting that there has been much criticism directed at education and educational leaders throughout the country, particularly education's high costs. Key issues discussed are as follows: (1) Concern for early childhood education, which could become a vigorous component in the struggle for Federal money (According to the author, if there is a struggle to put more money in early education and other areas, it might well be that vocational education's effort to get a larger part of the Federal share has reached a plateau.); (2) the possible creation, under the new administration, of a new department of education, which could intensify competition between higher education and elementary secondary education, between vocational and early childhood education, and between the research people and the program people; (3) the consolidation of Federal programs; and (4) the authorization (under the Educational Amendments of 1976) of teacher centers, and emphasis on the problem of retraining people for both different occupations and skills and opportunities during their entire lifetime. (SH)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

**NEEDED FEDERAL POLICY IN EDUCATION
FOR CENTURY III**

RECEIVED
JUL 20 1977
INFO, ACQ, CVE

by

Wilbur J. Cohen
Dean of the School of Education
University of Michigan

The Center for Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

January 1977

PREFACE

Dr. Wilbur J. Cohen, Dean of the College of Education and Professor of Education, and Professor of Public Welfare Administration in the School of Social Work, University of Michigan, presented a paper to The Center and The Ohio State University staff on the topic of "Needed Federal Policy in Education for Century III." Dean Cohen's professional experience and background in multiple social science fields eminently qualifies him to recognize and analyze federal policy needs in education.

In his paper, Dr. Cohen addresses current issues in education resulting from the change in federal administration and how these changes will affect the twenty-three years that remain of this century.

Dr. Cohen was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare during 1968—the seventh secretary since the department was established in 1953. He has been associated with the broad fields related to human well-being during his entire professional career—as teacher, administrator, and policy-maker.

He was appointed Assistant Secretary for Legislation in HEW in January 1961 by President Kennedy. During the four and one half years he served in that post, he was responsible for handling some sixty-five major legislative proposals, including such landmark measures as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Higher Education Act, the Vocational Education Act of 1965, Medicare, and Social Security legislation. As principal lieutenant to Secretary John Gardner for a period of two and one-half years, he was responsible for coordinating major policy issues between the Legislative and Executive branches as the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (1965-68).

Dr. Cohen was appointed Professor of Public Welfare Administration at The University of Michigan in 1955. He was Chairman of President Kennedy's Task Force on Health and Social Security in 1960 which recommended Medicare, federal aid for medical education, and other health, social security and public welfare proposals.

He came to Washington in 1934 as research assistant to the Executive Director of President Roosevelt's Cabinet Committee on Economic Security, which drafted the original Social Security Act. In 1935 he joined the staff of the Social Security Board and subsequently was Director of its Division of Research and Statistics from 1953 to 1956.

He graduated from the University of Wisconsin in Economics in 1934 from which he also received the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws in 1966. He also holds honorary degrees from Adelphi, Yeshiva, Brandeis, Kenyon, Detroit, Louisville, Cleveland State, Ohio State, Michigan State, Central Michigan, and Florida State Universities.

Dr. Cohen is the author of several books and articles in the social security, health, welfare, and education fields. Among his books are *Retirement Policies under Social Security*; he is co-author of *Social Security Programs: Problems and Policies, Towards Freedom from Want, and Income and Welfare*. He has written articles on "Education and Learning," "The Earning and Learning Force," "A Ten-Point Program to Abolish Poverty," and Social Indicators and a Social Report.

He has been the recipient of awards and citations for distinguished service in health, education, and welfare, including the Rockefeller Public Service Award, the Jane Addams Award, and the Bronfman Prize for Public Health Achievement. He was President of the National Conference on Social Welfare, 1969-70, President of the American Public Welfare Association, 1975-76, a Chairman of the Michigan Arbitration Advisory Committee on Medical Malpractice, 1975-76, and a member of the American Hospital Association's National Advisory Committee on Health.

The Ohio State University and The Center for Vocational Education take pleasure in sharing with you Dr. Cohen's presentation, "Needed Federal Policy in Education for Century III."

Robert E. Taylor
Director

THE CENTER MISSION STATEMENT

The Center for Vocational Education's mission is to increase the ability of diverse agencies, institutions, and organizations to solve educational problems relating to individual career planning, preparation, and progression. The Center fulfills its mission by:

- Generating knowledge through research
- Developing educational programs and products
- Evaluating individual program needs and outcomes
- Installing educational programs and products
- Operating information systems and services
- Conducting leadership development and training programs

NEEDED FEDERAL POLICY IN EDUCATION FOR CENTURY III

I am going to speak briefly about a number of subjects today in order to stimulate your interest, as well as your frustration, so that you will continue to follow these subjects or to talk about them among yourselves. My topic has changed somewhat; it will be current issues in education resulting from the change of administration in Washington and how these changes will affect the twenty-three years that remain of this century. I believe that the remaining years will be largely determined by the actions we take in the next four to eight years. My first assumption is that there is the possibility of a sharp break in the educational policy of the last ten years. Changes that result from the break will be, as one might expect, good, bad, and indifferent. Some of us will be able to adapt to the changes if we can first determine our role in making them.

I also believe that we stand at an important moment in education—a time where much criticism is being directed at education and educational leaders throughout the country. It would be possible for us under certain circumstances to make the wrong decisions with the result that education would go into a slow decline during the next twenty-five years. One of the charges directed against education is its high cost. Obviously education has been costing a lot of money—well over a \$100 billion a year, nearly 8 percent of the gross national product—and many people feel they are not getting their money's worth. In fact, the millages at the elementary and secondary levels are failing to pass because people don't want to put any more money into the property tax. At the federal level, more money for education has not received the overwhelming support of most taxpayers and the media during the last few years. Obviously, much frustration has been building up about the need for a change, but whether the change was meant to be to an expansion in the role of education and in money for education or a contraction, putting education at a lower priority, has been hard to determine—and this represents the key policy decision to be made in the near future.

When we look at public opinion polls about educational policy however, it is interesting to note that in recent NORC polls approximately 50 percent of those who answered said they think the United States is not spending enough money for education. Some University of Michigan studies made during the last fifteen years have shown that this figure has reached 60 percent. Both figures are rather startling when we realize how strongly the taxpayers have been cutting back on millages and bond issues; even federal expenditures under the existing federal administration have been cut back. The fact of the matter is that people are willing to spend more money on education, but they don't want the property tax to be utilized for the purpose because of its impact on low-income and old people and those on fixed incomes. This is my conclusion from an analysis of the problem. We must, therefore, find another source for the money.

Most people however, are not happy with the suggestion that the federal government supply the necessary funds. Consequently, my high-priority federal-aid-to-education proposal for the next several years is to federalize the financing of the welfare and medicaid system in the United States. The mounting costs of medicaid and welfare caused by inflation and unemployment have made it

difficult for governors and legislators to raise, and in some cases even maintain, the level of state appropriations for education and related matters. With the tremendous increase in utilization, and to some extent the fraud and overutilization of welfare services, a state legislator, governor, or budget director, no matter how enthusiastic about doing more for higher education or elementary, early childhood, and vocational education, is faced with the reality that uncontrollable welfare costs have eaten up whatever accretion has been generated as a result of other economic factors.

I believe that educational leaders should help take a leadership role in making possible the adoption of a national health insurance program that would take the medicaid costs off the back of the states. A contributory and federally financed health system would have a remarkable effect in equalizing and making more equitable the rising health costs of the nation—costs which will probably continue to increase for the next ten or fifteen years, even if we put into effect tomorrow morning every cost containment method we know. Just talk with physicians, hospital administrators, and others about cost containment in the health field. The fact is that with the new science and technology that is going into medical care—for example, the coaxial brain scanner which costs about \$400 to 500 thousand—expenses are bound to rise. And of course we will need more paraprofessional personnel, and we are producing more doctors. All this will provide us with more medical care, but it will also cost us more money. The increase in welfare and medical costs will, in my opinion, make the possibility of getting more state money for education even more difficult. President-Elect Carter's commitment to some kind of national health insurance system and to a federally financed welfare system represents what I call priority number one in federal aid to education. I leave you with the rather monumental realization of what must be done in the next few years to achieve the objective of more money for education.

Another critical educational concern for the future is the area of early childhood education. State and local educational systems have been least involved in this area because of financial limitations and because of considerable controversy. The so-called Brademas-Mondale Bill of 1971, which provided additional federal money for Headstart, day care, and early childhood development, was vetoed by President Nixon and was attacked as being the entry wedge to communism. Thousands upon thousands of letters have come in to Mr. Brademas and Mr. Mondale about their communist/socialist "leanings" because they attempt to "force" little children into "camps" for day care and early childhood development. But Mondale is now Vice President of the United States, and I suspect that, although there has been this rather remarkable attack on early childhood education, he will attempt, along with others, to expand the federal government's financing role in early childhood education and the role of the states and, speaking for myself, the role of schools of education in the preparation of faculty, teachers, researchers, and administrators in that field.

Al Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers supports the use of federal funds for early childhood education, and he supports the Brademas-Mondale Bill and the day care and early childhood development advocates. Why? Because he's trying to deal with the problem of teacher surplus. The problem cannot be dealt with in Detroit, for example, by reducing the student-faculty ratio from thirty-six to one, thirty-five to one, or thirty-four to one and employing new teachers because the millage proposal was defeated again. Efforts to reduce class size can create difficult problems because a good deal of research indicates that this is not a particularly significant way to improve the quality of education; in other words those who do believe it is an effective way have difficulty producing the research information that sustains that argument. Although some parents will support such a belief, without the research to prove it, a lot of others won't.

I would, therefore, make a strong guess that in the immediate future early childhood education will become a vigorous component in the struggle for federal money. There is also another factor,

and that is that with the struggle to put more money in early childhood education and in other areas it might well be that vocational education's effort to get a larger part of the federal share has reached a plateau. In early childhood education, I think we could easily put \$2, 3, 4, or 5 billion in the next few years without batting an eye, assuming we have the money. Why? Because the student-faculty ratio there is not one to thirty or one to thirty-five; the argument is about whether it's one to four, one to five, or one to six. The annual twelve-month cost for early childhood development is in the nature of \$3,600 or \$4,000 per pupil for comprehensive high quality care, as compared with about \$1,500 per pupil, or even \$1,600 or \$1,700 two or three years from now, for elementary and secondary education. So there are bound to be some difficult questions about competition for money in the foreseeable future in which perhaps the conflict may be pushed—although not right away—at the state level if the state is going to have more money than the federal government, because to take over the health and welfare area the federal government at present prices would probably have to put about \$30 billion more federal money into these total programs. I doubt that anybody who voted for Mr. Carter thought in these specific terms, but probably a lot of the people who voted against him did. We will have to wait and see what happens.

The issues that Mr. Carter posed when he said he was going to create a new department of education will probably result—at least as I see it—in a considerable conflict within the next several years. I don't happen to be either supportive or enthusiastic about a federal department of education. I think it's much too early to consider such an action. It would put education way out in front to be sacked easily because it says that all we're going to do for education during the next four to eight years is to create a department—you've got your playhouse now; go out and play and we'll give the money to somebody else. A separate department would also divorce education people from the mainstream of other key social and political issues which they ought to be more interested in, and, in my opinion, it would create pressures for the establishment of many other special federal departments, a possibility of which I'm sure Mr. Carter never thought. But within education itself, the competition between higher education and elementary and secondary education, between vocational and early childhood education, and between the research people and the program people is going to become more intense during the next four, eight, twelve, and fifteen years. I can see each of them trying to carve out its domain in a separate department of education so that it can control its own area.

Those of you in vocational education will understand very well what I am saying because you've done a good job in the past few years of creating your own domain. How you continue to sustain yourselves against others who organize as well as you have or better remains to be seen. The last thing I would like, however, is to be fighting with my own colleagues about my share of the pie or the proper role of my program against what they want and arguing that I'm more important than they are—or hearing them argue that they are more important than I am or that they should have the next million dollars or should control a particular program. I hope that none of these conflicts occurs. But as we fight for more money and more program development, it seems to me that the possibility of conflict becomes greater.

There is also no doubt that a key issue during the next few years, as indicated by what has happened until now, will be the consolidation of federal programs. The concept of consolidation sounds great—just listen to anyone who has talked about the 250 education programs, their different formulae, and forms, the impact of affirmative action and title nine, and record keeping. Or listen to any of us who are administrators in the university or elsewhere dealing with the confusion, chaos, complexity, overlapping, and difficulty in the proliferation of programs. I doubt, however, whether vocational education and early childhood education should be consolidated just because both are education programs. Such a consolidation would not, I am sure, have the enthusiastic support of

either group or be valuable for either group and would result in few if any economies, administrative or otherwise.

If programs are going to be consolidated, the issue of the role of the state department of education must be considered. The simplest procedure in any consolidation would be to let all the money flow through the state department of education because education is a state function. As enthusiastic as I am for that general idea, however, I wouldn't like all the money to be state controlled anymore than I would like all the money to be federally controlled or locally controlled. I think the pluralistic genius of this country has been our somewhat diverse and complex system in which the federal government provides certain leadership for innovation and experimentation, the states try to assure certain elements of equity and distribution and standard setting, and the local communities try to solve the special problems of their children. If there is going to be consolidation and an examination of the role of the state department of education, then we must look at education on a more metropolitan basis, that is, financing and program development must combine the inner city and the suburb in some rational, intelligent way, irrespective of school districts in that particular area. Inner city and suburban boundary lines really have no relationship to the educational attainment of the children, their future mobility, or their potential role as workers or citizens. If I could make one single complaint about the present organization of education in the United States, it is that the political lines of school districts should not be related to the financing, but to access, non-discrimination, and quality of education. I, therefore, hope that as we talk about consolidation and the roles of the state and federal governments, we look at the total metropolitan area. We can't, for example, give the states \$6 billion a year for federal revenue sharing without requiring them to think in metropolitan terms.

If I were asked, what would you want to do in education if you could deal with the situation more constructively than it has been dealt with in the past, particularly in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I would say that probably the federal government ought to give some earmarked money for improving the quality of education. I think we have been struggling in the years since 1963—when we started with federal aid to medical education and the vocational education act, leading to ESEA—with what the federal role should be. Maybe we should now turn from specific types of programs, without repealing the ones we have, to begin to require that the money spent on them deal particularly with improving the quality of education. What is the definition of "improving the quality of education?" I think we could use some initiative and experimentation and give the school districts in the state an opportunity, with some planning money, to determine their own definitions. Improvement might be in the basic skills, particularly reading and writing, which would have the overwhelming support of parents.

In fact, parents must be included in this entire political, educational process. If we want more money for education, more programs, and new directions, parents as taxpayers and as citizens and community leaders must be brought into a closer working relationship with educational leaders. This will not be as easy as it sounds because parents and citizens will have different priorities and emphases than professional educators. It is, however, the "name of the game" and something we will have to deal with. In this and other ways we can concentrate on improving the quality of education from preschool to lifetime learning. I would have no age or program limits on quality education, and in formulating plans and objectives, I would try to utilize the best thinking, the best ideas, and the best experience in the United States.

I'd like to conclude with what is on my mind and that is, how does higher education, particularly schools of education, fit into the opportunities that lie ahead in education for the rest of this century? If we look at the Educational Amendments of 1976 that were just passed by Congress and signed by

the President, we see for the first time federal authorization for teacher centers—a new direction, or at least a new emphasis, by federal government on in-service training and post-degree education outside the normal role of higher education. I am not happy with the legislation because it proposes only one model, and I think several models should have been financed to see which would work best, but I recognize that the dissatisfaction with preservice preparation in schools of education has led the teacher unions into promoting the whole role of teacher centers, a role which I think will expand greatly. We must also consider the relationship between school systems and the unions. The whole effort in higher education must begin to look outside the university into relationships with other kinds of institutions. This means that we can't simply look at student course credit hours produced or number of hours taught on campus. We may even radically change our concept of resident credits. Although such a change sounds simple, it may transform our concepts of inputs to outputs, residential to nonresidential, and academic, professionally related experiences to different kinds of experiential work in the labor market and in the school systems.

The 1976 Education Amendments also contain funds and provisions for learning. As we look at what is happening in the whole labor market and the industrial scene—which some of you know much better than I—we note that geographic and occupational mobility have made it possible for persons to change skills and jobs several times, each shift requiring opportunities for relearning and reeducating. I started out as an economic historian, and I'm so far away from being an economic historian today that there is no resemblance between what I am doing now and to what I thought I was going to do when I graduated from college. There is and will continue to be much more emphasis on second and third careers during a person's lifetime. How will our educational system deal with the problem of retraining and retreading people for both different occupations and skills and opportunities during their entire lifetime? Congress has now recognized in the amendments that the federal government must participate in this area, at least to get the subject discussed and to receive ideas. I predict that out of this rather modest beginning will come a fundamental reexamination of the different roles of education into the entire job, business, career learning cycle.

I feel that there is a tremendous challenge ahead of us in education. It is a strange phenomenon in American life that great challenges and changes are so highly correlated with presidential elections. Somehow in our peculiar social, economic, and political system people feel the need for changes in eight or sixteen-year cycles. Professor Arthur Schlesinger, Sr. once developed a theory of history that went in sixteen to twenty-year cycles, and the twenty-year cycle was largely based upon the change in generations, a theory in which I happen to believe. As each generation moves along there occurs a change in attitude as people get to be over thirty and become the older generation, and that change tends to correspond in some way with these four, eight, and sixteen-year political cycles.

Whether the cycle theory is accurate or not, I do submit that we stand at a moment in educational policy when we have an opportunity to make important change. We have a new President, Vice President, and Congress, and enough time has elapsed for the Vietnam war to have nearly disappeared in terms of the anxiety and frustrations it created. Many of those involved in student dissent, frustration, and alienation are now parents themselves. Thus, perhaps slowly, and I don't mean right away, but somehow during these next four or eight years those of us who are educators will have a chance to work on new emphases and new opportunities. But, like in the 1960s, not all will turn out successfully. Not all will usher in the millenium. I think that the overwhelming emphasis in this new challenge will be these ideas I've discussed, tempered by a new sense of managerial capacity. This is the sense that we will do what we are competent to do, probably by the process of phased, incremental development that is directed toward a goal but tempered by the managerial capacity to put it into effect, recognizing the wide variety of American experience, attitudes, and skepticism about many great ideals.

I am not sure about the year 2000, but I am as certain as I can be that the decisions we will make from 1977 to 1980 will determine the quality of life we will have in the year 2000. It is not easy to change the terms and conditions of human society in the short run, as much as we would like to do so. But it is possible, I believe, to change the structure of our educational system, its financing and some of the related programs I talked about. If so, we can have not only an excellent but a better educational system in the year 2000 that would meet more diversified needs, that would be more flexible, and that would recognize the individuality of each child and adult. Those of us who are teachers, researchers, and administrators in the educational system would thus have an opportunity to contribute and produce something vital to the continued dynamism of our nation.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Do you think in this next period (1976-1980) that a change will occur in the process of educational decision-making made on a political basis vs. a merit basis?

Let me take the research question first, as I have a little better answer on that than on the first one. I would say that the one successful thing that has happened in the last few years is that we finally have gotten NIE reauthorized and continued after probably the worst debacle in education that we have had in the last twenty-five to fifty years, at least at the national level. NIE was conceived, in my opinion, without adequate consultation and was implemented in a unilateral and political way which was bound to result in an almost disastrous situation for both education and research. As a result of a lot of people putting a lot of effort into it, the reauthorization that exists now does auger well, it seems to me, for the next four-eight-ten years in further building upon that base. I think if you take both the NIE and the National Center for Educational Statistics, we are now in a better position today to look forward to building upon them in a non-political way than ever before. Now again, I'm not going to say that all of the research that will be produced in the next couple of years or five years or ten years is going to change the whole nature of education, because I doubt it. But at least in that area, I feel better this minute; I don't know whether you do, but I do—a little bit safer and I sleep better at night. I think that if higher education works well with the other groups, as you and others have been doing, it could lead to progressive financial improvements in NIE and in the other areas. This is important because implicit in your statement and implicit in my bias is, basically, that you can't get educational research out of local school boards or state departments of education. The difficulty of sustaining research in the university—where you have no controls and where you shouldn't have any controls on research—is that the dissertation process and the research emphasis has to be by the individual student and the individual investigator. If you want research to be both wider, more innovative, and more experimental, whether you want to have target research or non-target research, I think you have to depend on the leverage of the federal government. I don't mean that the federal government has to finance it all, but it must use its leverage with the whole educational system.

Now on your other question, I guess I would have to say, not in a perforative sense, that education will become more politicized in the next twenty-five years. Why? If you're spending \$100 billion at 8 percent of the gross national product, and let's say you were to agree with me that by the year 2000 we should be spending 9 or 10 percent of a gross national product that ought to be at least twice as much—at present-day prices \$250 billion—it is obvious that as a result education will be "regulated." What does that mean? It means, as I tried to indicate before, that state legislatures and others are going to be more involved in the decision-making process. Also, I think you have to make the assumption that there will be a greater degree of organization in education in the next ten to twenty-five years. I don't know if the MEA and the AFT will combine, but whether they combine or not they are going to be much more influential.

I am happy that my tenure in higher education is coming to an end, because I think that there will be more organization in higher education, and as a dean I view that development with mixed feelings. I've been picketed and everything so far, but I don't look forward to having to deal with collective bargaining on everything that is involved in the decisions we have now on the number of students in classes, the number of graduate students per teacher, and XYZ. So I think that there will be more "political" influence, not partisan political, but group demands for self-realization which ultimately will bring conflict that must be decided by some generalist, whether governor, state budget director, university president, or higher education board. Therefore, I think we have to become more alert, a conclusion I made when I observed that education people should form more coalitions outside of education. If we only talk to ourselves and only divide up what we have among ourselves and only think what we ourselves think is right and everybody else is wrong and if we come to a crisis and have no plans outside of our own group, then we may well be isolated. I think that is the case today and the case tomorrow. And it could be the case in the year 2000. So I'm not so worried about politicalization in terms of old-time selection of and individual teacher or person because he was someone's brother-in-law or something like that; rather I am concerned about differences in priorities that are reflected in the power of groups because of the coalitions they've made.

2. Hitchhiking on that last statement of the increased politicalization of education—one person, one vote—how can research and development contribute information to policy makers to help them make the tough decisions among funding alternatives? For example, going back to an earlier comment, it isn't hard to see that the brain scanner costs more than the blood letting or that modern education costs more than rote learning of the past. We are going to develop more options than society can afford. So how do we make the tough decision and how do we hopefully make those decisions more empirically based on fact rather than just values or speculations? And more specifically, what can research and development contribute to answering those tough decisions?

Well, first, if I knew a good answer, I'd patent it and sell it and retire. The problem is exceedingly complex for several reasons. Let me enumerate them briefly before I answer the question. One is the change in the demographic situation in the United States in which, because of the decline in the fertility rate, we're going to have fewer proportionate children under age eighteen in the population and substantially more aged people. There are now 22 million people over age sixty-five; sixty-five years from now there are going to be 50 million. I see the demographic problems as the political problem. The more of any group of people, the more they are going to vote, the greater role they are going to have, but who will get what share of the pie? Up until now, the pie has been getting bigger, and as the pie got bigger we gave something to everybody—the people who worked, the people who retired, the young people, the rich and the poor, the black and the white—not necessarily equitable, but everybody got a little of something. But if the demographic situation changes markedly at the same time that the economic situation results in a more or less economic-growth society, then these kinds of questions become more difficult. I'd like to inject only two things. From my experience in the government, cost-benefit analysis is very perilous. Many cost-benefit analyses were given to me when I was a decision-maker which didn't help me make a decision. Why? Because outside of cost-benefit, quantitative analysis are a series of subjective, qualitative factors about self-fulfillment which are an important element in education that other people leave out. If I prefer to read a book or to listen to music, are these activities any less important than my working an extra hour to produce more chrome on an automobile? But how are these things put into cost benefit analysis? Somebody—the decision-maker, I believe—has to put them in.

These kinds of questions are going to become more critical. Are you going to be in favor of reduction of hours in the future so that people have more leisure time as compared with a higher increase in wages growing out of working longer? Because of more women in the labor market are we going to accept the four-day week at forty hours or thirty-eight or thirty-seven and one-half or thirty-two? I don't know exactly how to put into a cost-benefit analysis all of the questions that relate to changes in lifestyles, family organizations, and relationships between husband and wife who are both working with fewer young children; therefore, I think that future research will have to investigate the issue of quality of life. If I could only do one thing that related to the matter of quality of life, I would create in the United States a council of social advisors to be parallel to the council of economic advisors so that not all our decisions would be based upon the international balance of trade or the growth in the GNP. Some questions to be asked by such a council are: "What is the impact of this or that on the family, given the relationship between husband and wife of sharing the work load at home?" or, "If there are fewer children and more older people, what is the responsibility of the middle-aged family?"

I'm not saying that economics is not important; the only way we will get more money for education is for our economic growth to increase. But it may be that we have to settle for a slightly slower rate of growth if we want environmental conditions to be satisfied along with education. I would like to see quality-of-life research in the universities greatly increase during the next ten years, comparable to other kinds of research. I'd like to see a council of social economic advisors at the national level constantly producing a social report on the whole society that was not limited to the rate of growth to the GNP.

3. What is the role of vocational education programs in educational settings in capacitating individuals to be effectively employed in the future?

Well, I don't know that I have a good answer. I think the best thing I can say is that I think we need more choices for people within the school system. By choice: I mean different kinds of programs both for people who are going to go on to college and for people who are going to terminate in high school and maybe go back to school ten or twenty years later. I would like to see a community in which there were at least three or four kinds of "schools" or "education" offering parents and students the choice as to which they would attend; each would be a model of different emphases that would put different packages of skills in different places. I think if you were to ask parents, they'd say, "well, we want two models—one where there is high discipline and one where there is more freedom."

In the occupational and career area, I would provide a greater degree of opportunity in the public schools for more kinds of vocational and career interest, and I guess that I would tie that in more closely with community colleges. There ought to be a better kind of tie-in between the public school system and post-secondary two-year colleges; we could probably provide and focus resources on that interrelationship and maybe even have students going back and forth and have faculty members going back and forth. More exchange of faculty members is important because we tend to get too provincial as faculty members and teachers, and maybe moving around more in a slightly larger tenure system and a larger metropolitan system would be good. I'd like to see some teachers who wanted to move back and forth between the inner city and the suburbs and move from one area of concentration to another. These ideas may all be impractical, although if we get the extent of collective bargaining and negotiations that I think we will they are probably likely to occur.

4. What are the most important groups for vocational educators to form coalitions with outside education, and what are the dangers?

The danger, of course, is proliferating ourselves so widely that we don't do our own job well. I know in my own job there is more to do in eight or ten hours a day or forty hours a week than I can do now; so if I'm going to do something else, I probably would have to give up something, and I recognize that as a possibility. We must maintain our sense of excellence and our skills and values and be professional in order to retain our self-respect and that of others.

I think the entire education system, particularly vocational education, must relate itself much more directly to the business and labor community. It doesn't need to get involved in collective bargaining, but it ought to be working cooperatively wherever it can with those businesses that want to place and hire minorities. It also should be working with unions or others that would like to get women on the career ladder faster and much more effectively so that they can get the experiences to move up the ladder to executive and other positions. There are real possibilities now in the community to do this.

Another area for vocational education—and in my opinion the most difficult—is working with welfare departments to help train welfare recipients for jobs. Interestingly enough, the bulk of those on welfare are women, despite the conception that welfare harbors thousands if not millions of men who have work potential. The fact of the matter is that there are very few men on welfare—perhaps not more than 100,000—and most of them are either physically or mentally disabled or have other limitations, but there are 3½ million women on welfare today. If all the women eligible to be on welfare were on it, the figure would be closer to 5 million. Many women who are the heads of families or single are not on welfare because they happen to live in states where that eligibility is not sustained by the availability of funds. Let's say they are in New York or Detroit or Philadelphia or somewhere else and they have somewhere between 10 and 15 million children; the possibility of training and job placement and early childhood care for their children in order to improve the educational attainment of the next generation offers a tremendous opportunity that's been talked about over the last ten years, but nobody has successfully tackled it.

Another suggestion I have does not relate to vocational education, but to education in general. I think if we're going into the health field, the phased-in program should be on children and on mothers and children to make it possible over the next few years to dovetail early childhood education, and increased health services for children and then deal with another social problem we haven't talked, teenage pregnancies. One of the most serious social problems in this country which nobody is successfully dealing with is the problem of fourteen, fifteen, sixteen-year-old girls becoming mothers, having abortions, and as mothers trying to sustain the financial, educational, and other needs of their children. Because they are ill prepared for these responsibilities, the result is tremendous social disorganization and difficulties for countless children and complications for the welfare program to the point where many of the new cases on welfare are teenage youngsters. I see the possibility of education people and health people working much more closely in this area.

5. What guarantee is there that the funds collected for the social welfare programs at the federal level will be channelled for such programs?

The only way I know is to organize yourself to be a full participant in the democratic process. There is no other absolute way to insure that funds collected will be used for the programs; but look at the successful model that vocational education has used since 1971. Vocational education--its leaders and the methods they have used--has succeeded in getting what it thinks is its rightful share of the education pie. Vocational education people in 1960 got President-Elect Kennedy to sign a statement on vocational education, and that was the origin of the 1963 Vocational Education Act. Now if you want to call that politics in terms of what we've talked, fine. But my experience says that's the way it's done.

6. Allocating federal dollars to states for education has presented problems in the past in regard to insuring that they are used to deal with the real problems in education. What can be done to change this dilemma?

I was not at that point expressing my own formula for how to allocate federal money to the states for education; I was expressing the fact that there would be other methods of getting money than solely to the states. I do not see how one can avoid politically giving some money to the states. I was arguing for some assurance that the money will go directly to the metropolitan districts and to the school districts to improve the quality of education, that it wouldn't go solely through state departments of education. I was trying to be realistic, and I can show you some scars I got when some of us advocated in Title III that 25 percent would be retained by the federal government and would go directly to universities and school districts. That has been challenged many times because under our constitution's political system, education is in the control of the states.

After that's been said a few times, the best you can do is get some money set-aside that's direct to the universities, direct to individual investigators, or direct to school districts. I think your point is well taken, and if you feel that way you will have a very hard rope to tow. I understand that the state superintendents of public instruction in Washington have recently said, "Don't let those people who have been traditionally opposed to the state departments of education get their nose in the door in the new administration." The issue has, therefore, partly been defined and already been joined. And that's just one of the issues I said would become apparent unless we try or organize new institutional structures for new pieces of legislation.